

Academic Planning and Assessment
SACSCOC REPORT

Academic Planning and Assessment

Effective And Efficient Administrative Practices

Goal Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will contribute to the creation and maintenance of effective and efficient administrative practices.

RELATED ITEMS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Catalog Improvements

Performance Objective Description:

Make improvements to both the undergraduate and graduate catalogs in order to make them more effective for students, advisors, faculty, and administrative staff.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Improve Catalogs By Standardization.

KPI Description:

Improvements to the undergraduate and graduate catalog content and editing processes are necessary based upon feedback from faculty, advisors, students, and administrators. The improvements should address both content and editing functionality.

Results Description:

In March 2016, the institution successfully published the 2016-2017 Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs. A number of improvements and changes were realized in order to improve catalog accuracy, functionality, and logistics. Changes included:

1. Transitioning from a two-year catalog to a one-year catalog to better align with the degree audit system, DegreeWorks
2. Implementing a third-party software, CourseLeaf, to manage and improve the efficiency of the catalog editing process
3. Implementing a semester-by-semester course recommendation sequence for degree programs as supported by advising best practices
4. Bringing standardization to each degree plan with regard to plan structure and presentation.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Create A Curriculum Plan For Academic Affairs

Performance Objective Description:

Develop a Curriculum Plan that incorporates strategic planning and budget.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Curriculum Plan

KPI Description:

Develop and complete the Curriculum Plan and develop budget spreadsheets and white paper forms to use with the plan.

Results Description:

A curriculum plan was created and implemented during the 2015-2016 academic year. A prospective list of future programs was solicited from each academic department, along with projections of necessary resources. In addition, the white paper process was implemented. The additional program projections and white paper submissions provided incremental improvements in the strategic planning process.

However, the processes were not fully implemented to the extent of being used in budgetary discussions.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Curriculum Process Improvement

Performance Objective Description:

Improve the curriculum process to provide better information to the university community.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Curriculum Improvement

KPI Description:

Improvements to the curriculum process should include building a process that includes the Registrar's Office and provides communications across necessary areas on campus to keep everyone informed of the process.

Results Description:

During the 2015-2016 academic year, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment made a number of improvements to the curriculum process:

- Formal and streamlined curriculum communication plans were implemented to more effectively and consistently communicate pending and approved curriculum changes to campus constituents (faculty, administrators, registrar, admissions, financial aid, advisors, etc).
- Formal curricular processes were implemented for curriculum changes previously inconsistently managed to include: (1) changes to department or college titles, (2) additions of minors, and (3) substantive changes to degree program content.
- Curriculum change timelines were modified to ensure adequate time between approval and implementation for necessary Banner programming changes.

Promote An Environment That Encourages Continuous Improvement Of Assessment Initiatives

Goal Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will encourage and promote an environment of continuous improvement for all departments, offices, and programs within the various Colleges and Divisions at Sam Houston State University.

RELATED ITEMS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Ensure Quality Annual Assessment Processes

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will ensure that members of the university community are conducting a quality, and effective annual assessment process.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Annual Meta-assessment Process

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will utilize a locally developed rubric designed to evaluate the overall quality of a program's annual assessment plans to facilitate an annual review of assessment plans stored within the Online Assessment Tracking Database (OATDB). The results of this evaluation should indicate that 80%, or more, of the reviewed assessment plans for each College/Division reviewed should be rated as “Acceptable” or better. Additionally 80%, or more, of the total number of assessment plans reviewed from across the University should be rated “Acceptable” or better.

Results Description:

During the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment oversaw the Meta-assessment review of assessment plans from six of the seven Academic Colleges. The College of Sciences has implemented a new meta-assessment process. Because of the timing of their review, results from there meta-assessment process were not available for this cycle. Four of the six remaining academic colleges conducted college-led meta-assessment reviews of their units. Units within the remaining two colleges were reviewed by Office of Academic Planning and Assessment Staff.

A summary of the results are provide here for each college. Percentages represent the percentage of acceptable and exemplary assessment plans/elements from each college:

College #1 - Self-reviewed	
Overall	76.19%
Goals	90.48%
Objectives	90.48%
Indicators	73.33%
Criterion	60.00%
KPIs	100.00%
Findings/Results	80.95%
Actions	57.14%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	57.14%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	57.14%

College #2 - Self-Reviewed

Overall	68.75%
Goals	75.00%
Objectives	75.00%
Indicators	70.00%
Criterion	50.00%
KPIs	83.33%
Findings/Results	62.50%
Actions	56.25%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	68.75%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	43.75%

College #3 - OAPA Reviewed

Overall	28.57%
Goals	50.00%
Objectives	67.86%
Indicators	59.09%
Criterion	45.45%
KPIs	25.00%
Findings/Results	50.00%
Actions	28.57%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	55.56%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	17.86%

College #4 - Self-reviewed

Overall	73.33%
Goals	80.00%
Objectives	86.67%
Indicators	73.33%
Criterion	66.67%
KPIs	N/A
Findings/Results	73.33%
Actions	80.00%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	70.43%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	60.00%

College #5 - OAPA Reviewed

Overall	0.00%
Goals	85.00%
Objectives	60.00%
Indicators	46.67%
Criterion	60.00%
KPIs	71.43%
Findings/Results	55.00%
Actions	5.00%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	38.89%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	0.00%

College #6 - Self-reviewed

Overall	77.78%
Goals	92.59%
Objectives	92.59%
Indicators	86.36%
Criterion	85.00%
KPIs	77.78%
Findings/Results	66.67%
Actions	59.26%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	77.78%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	70.37%

Overall for all Academic Colleges

Overall	52.76%
Goals	77.95%
Objectives	78.74%
Indicators	68.69%
Criterion	61.86%
KPIs	71.74%
Findings/Results	63.78%
Actions	45.67%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	61.79%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	40.94%

Overall for Self-Reviewed Colleges

Overall	76.19%
Goals	88.89%
Objectives	90.48%
Indicators	78.85%
Criterion	72.00%
KPIs	84.00%
Findings/Results	73.02%
Actions	63.49%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	69.35%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	63.49%

Overall for OAPA Reviewed Colleges

Overall	29.69%
Goals	67.19%
Objectives	67.19%
Indicators	57.45%
Criterion	51.06%
KPIs	57.14%
Findings/Results	54.69%
Actions	28.13%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	54.10%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	18.75%

These results reveal several areas for institutional improvement. No individual college exceeded 80% for all assessment plan elements. Generally, the following elements saw the greatest weakness (i.e., percentages less than 70%):

- Overall Score

- Indicators
- Criterion
- Findings/KPI Results
- Actions
- PCI Update
- PCI

Despite these areas for improvement, the Meta-assessment processes has revealed a number of areas of encouragement as well. Five of the seven academic colleges have instituted their own, locally-led Meta-assessment processes. The effect of this has been to increase the importance and visibility of quality assessment practices within each of the these colleges. Additionally, a norming review of the college-led processes has revealed that they have increased in quality and accuracy. It is little surprise, then, that that two colleges that did not have their own Meta-assessment processes also had the worst rated assessment plans. More work needs to be done with these colleges in particular to emphasize the importance of good assessment practice.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Provide Quality Assessment Support Resources

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will provide quality assessment resources to the University community through its website, ongoing training sessions, and workshops.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Number Of Workshops/Training Sessions Held

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will conduct at least 50 workshops/training sessions related to the annual assessment process being conducted at SHSU. These sessions may range from large, group workshops to individual training sessions.

Results Description:

In past years, the Director of Assessment maintained an Excel spreadsheet through which he attempted to track each and every meeting, workshop, and training session. However, with the expansion of services provided by the office, and the expansion in the number of staff members for the office, this manual system has become unwieldy and was dropped for the 2015-2016 cycle. Although information is not available on the total number of training sessions held for 2015-2015, part data are available. With the transition to the new CampusLabs - Compliance Assist assessment management system, OAPA staff held a large number of formal workshops to train new users. Additionally, the Director of Assessment instituted a new workshop series for 2015-2016, informal Assessment "Brownbags."

A breakdown of the total number of events is found below:

CampusLabs Trainings (Group and Individual) - 47

Assessment Brownbags - 4

In looking at just these sessions alone, OAPA staff exceeded the desired number of training sessions and workshops for the 2015-2016 cycle.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Website Tracking

KPI Description:

Utilizing Google Analytics, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will track traffic coming to the department's website. Data from the 2014-2015 cycle will serve as a baseline for subsequent assessment cycles.

Results Description:

Starting with the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment has partnered with Computer Services to provide detailed Google Analytics reports regarding all of the various OAPA Webpages. This will give OAPA staff a much more detailed and robust picture of visits to, and usage of, OAPA websites and documents. Unfortunately, because of a change in the report formatting, direct comparisons to 2014-2015 data are not available. The table below contains an overview of the total number of pageviews OAPA webpages received combined. A complete breakdown of each monthly, as well as an annual report, are provided in the attached documents.

Combined Number of Pageviews/Unique Pageviews

for all OAPA Webpages - 2015-2016

Month	Pageviews	Unique Pageviews
September	877	760
October	517	460
November	593	463
December	548	465
January	658	550
February	627	541
March	523	441
April	785	578
May	526	442
June	1,086	817
July	1,586	1,333
August	1,410	1,133
Yearly Total	9,736	7,983

A further analyses of the data revealed the top 10 most visited OAPA websites:

Website	Pageviews	Unique Pageviews
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/index.html	4,307	3,609
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/campuslabs.html	1,894	1,630
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/about/	771	664
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/idea-evaluations	614	407
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/	348	276
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/resources.html	338	268
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/assessment-mini-grants.html	324	234
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/projects.html	298	249
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/catalog/index.html	270	201
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/accreditation/reports.html	148	102

It is good to see continued, and robust, web visits to the OAPA main page, and to many of the Office's important sub-pages. It is interesting to note that several of the webpages within the most visited included several pages centered upon relatively new activities or procedures for OAPA, particularly the new online IDEA evaluation system and the Course Catalogs. This would suggest that there have been interest in these processes, and that faculty and staff are accessing necessary information and resources. Finally, it is also encouraging to see that the second-most visited website was the page for access to, and information regarding, CampusLabs. This strongly indicates that users are accessing that information and using the new system.

Attached Files

- [02-APA GA Oct 2015](#)
- [03-APA GA Nov 2015](#)
- [04-APA GA Dec 2015](#)
- [05-APA GA Jan 2016](#)
- [06-APA GA Feb 2016](#)
- [07-APA GA Mar 2016](#)
- [08-APA GA Apr 2016](#)
- [09-APA GA May 2016](#)
- [10-APA GA Jun 2016](#)
- [11-APA GA Jul 2016](#)
- [13-APA GA Sept 15-Aug 16](#)
- [12-APA GA Aug 2016](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Workshop Evaluation Survey - Confidence

KPI Description:

Training session attendees will complete a brief survey, consisting of three Likert-scale question and three open-response questions, which indicate their satisfaction with the services provided by the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment and their confidence with assessment practices. A copy of the survey is provided as an attachment. 90% of respondents will report a pre-to-post increase in their confidence with regards to implementing effective programmatic assessment. Additionally, 90% of respondents reporting a post-score of 4 or 5, indicating they are now confident or very confident.

Results Description:

This KPI has been placed on hold for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle while its use is being reviewed by OAPA staff.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Workshop Evaluation Survey - Satisfaction

KPI Description:

Training session attendees will complete a brief survey, consisting of three Likert-scale questions and three open-response questions, which indicate their satisfaction with the services provided by the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment. A copy of the survey is provided as an attachment. The average response to the Likert-scale question related to participant satisfaction should be 4 or higher, indicating that they were satisfied with the services provided by our Office. Additionally, respondent comments from the three open-response questions should be generally positive.

Results Description:

This KPI has been placed on hold for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle while its use is being reviewed by OAPA staff.

Promote The Scholarship Of Assessment

Goal Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will promote the growing scholarship of assessment, within SHSU, Texas, and the nation, through research, presentations, and publications.

RELATED ITEMS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Assessment Mini-Grants

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will help promote the scholarship of assessment at SHSU through sponsorship of assessment mini-grants. These grants are available to faculty and staff at SHSU to help fund new or ongoing assessment practices within programs, offices, or departments; or to help fund travel to make assessment-related presentations at professional conferences.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Grant Awards For 2015-2016

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will award 10 \$1,000 Assessment Mini-Grants during the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. At the completion of each grant-funded project, each recipient will also complete and submit a follow-up report.

Results Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment received a total of 5 Assessment Mini-Grant applications, and only awarded 4 Assessment Mini-Grants for the during the 2015-2016 year, totaling \$3,250. The four awarded grants were as follows:

- \$1,000 to James Van Rokel, Lowman Student Center - Lowman Student Center Student Participation Tracking
- \$1,000 to Jose Santiago, Department of Kinesiology - Development of an Instrument to Assess Pre-Service Physical Education Teachers' Content Knowledge of Health-Related Fitness
- \$1,000 to Patsy Collins, Student Money Management Center - Classroom Assessment Utilizing Student Response Systems
- \$250 to Karla Eidson, Department of Curriculum and Instruction - First Generation College Students Perceptions of Study Abroad

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Scholarly Presentations And Publications

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will make presentations and submit publications on various assessment related topics through state, regional, and national venues.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Scholarly Presentations

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will track the number of scholarly presentations conducted by members of its staff for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. The minimum target for success will be 4 presentations at state, regional, or national conferences or meetings.

Results Description:

During the 2015-2016 year, Office of Academic Planning and Assessment Staff exceeded their objective of 4 presentations, making 6 XX presentations on assessment and accreditation topics at a variety of regional and national venues. These presentations are outlined as follows:

1. Roberts, J., & Franklin, S. (2015, December). *Using meta-assessment to evaluate programmatic assessment plans and build a culture of assessment*. Presented at the 2015 SACSCOC Annual Meeting, Houston, TX.
2. Jordan, J. D., & Roberts, J. (2015, December). *Student support services assessment: Moving beyond headcounts*. Presented at the 2015 SACSCOC Annual Meeting, Houston, TX.
3. Roberts, J. (2016, February). *Moving beyond means: Exploring how one university is using writing data to improve performance*. Poster presented at the 2015 AAC&U Conference on General Education and Assessment, New Orleans, LA.
4. Roberts, J. (2016, February). *Differences in student writing ability as a function of student characteristics at one Texas university*. Paper presented at the Southwest Educational Research Association Conference, New Orleans, LA.
5. Roberts, J. (2016, April). *Relationship between student writing ability and student characteristics at a Texas 4-year university*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
6. Franklin, S. (2016, July). A Successful Fifth Year Report: Organization and Details Matter. Workshop presented at the 2016 Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation, Grapevine, TX.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Scholarly Publications

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will track the number of scholarly articles submitted and accepted for publication by member of its staff. As this is a new measure the minimum target for success will be one article submitted and accepted for publication, per year.

Results Description:

For the 2015-2016 cycle, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment had one article submitted and accepted for publication:

- Flood, J. T., and Roberts, J. (Forthcoming 2017). The evolving nature of higher education accreditation: Legal considerations for institutional research and assessment professionals. *New Directions for Institutional Research*.

This article is part of a larger, edited volume focusing on accreditation in higher education and will be published in Spring 2017.

In addition, the Director of Assessment has several articles in draft status, which will hopefully be submitted Fall 2016.

Support And Facilitate The Undergraduate Program Review Process

Goal Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will support and facilitate the Undergraduate Program Review Process as Sam Houston State University.

RELATED ITEMS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Facilitate A Quality Undergraduate Program Review Process

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work to design, and ultimately implement, a quality undergraduate review process. The first steps involved with this project will be to study examples of best practice from institutions around the country and to develop a straw-man process for presentation to the leadership at SHSU for feedback and approval.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines

KPI Description:

Office of Academic Planning and Assessment Staff will conduct a search for best practices relating to undergraduate program review, and compile examples from institutions from around the country. These will then subsequently be used to develop a straw man undergraduate program review process for SHSU.

Results Description:

Upon hiring a new Coordinator III to assist with assessment activities in March 2016, research began for best practices of Undergraduate Program Review (UPR). Since that time the Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs/SACSCOC Liaison, Director of Assessment, and Coordinator had several meetings to discuss planning in stages. By the end of this assessment cycle a draft self-study document was created after thorough research of other institutions, and after receiving recommendations from the UPR meetings.

Support The Institution’s Ongoing Southern Association Of Colleges And Schools Commission On Colleges (SACSCOC) Accreditation Efforts

Goal Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will support the institution's ongoing efforts to respond to all SACSCOC requirements for maintaining accreditation.

RELATED ITEMS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Ensure Institutional Compliance With And Timely Submission Of Required SACSCOC Documentation

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work with the University administration to ensure that all required SACSCOC documents are submitted timely, and appropriately.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Address Functional Deficits In Faculty Credentials Reporting System

KPI Description:

Following the institution's conversion from a 'home-grown' ERP system to Banner, some functionality relating to Faculty Credentials reporting was lost. Steps will be taken to correct functional aspects of programming to include centralizing faculty degree entry into Banner and alteration of existing reports to align with new Banner structure.

Results Description:

During the 2015-2016 academic year, substantial progress was made in addressing the deficits in the faculty credentials reporting system. A taskforce worked to transition faculty degree and employment tracking from an Access file to the Banner system. All faculty employment and degree information was successfully transitioned into Banner.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Appropriate Submission Of SACSCOC Required Documentation

KPI Description:

The SACSCOC liaison, and the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment, will ensure that all required SACSCOC documents, such as Institutional Profiles, Letters of Notification, Prospectuses, Institutional Profiles, etc., will be summited timely and appropriately to the SACSCOC.

Results Description:

During the 2015-2016 academic year, all required SACSCOC documentation was submitted in a timely and appropriate manner.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Facilitate Completion Of The SACSCOC Fifth-Year Interim Report

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work with the University community to ensure the successful completion of the SACSCOC Fifth-Year Interim Report. To this end, the Office will work to disseminate information and resources, provide necessary training, and complete and submit all required documents.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Prepare A Quality And Thorough Compliance Narrative Document For The 5th Year Interim Report

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work with university personnel to ensure that a thorough, accurate, and quality compliance narrative document is prepared for the SACSCOC 5th Year Interim Report.

Results Description:

Sam Houston State University has successfully completed all the requirements of the 5th Year Interim Report for SACSCOC.

Support The Strategic Planning Process For The Division Of Academic Affairs

Goal Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will support the ongoing strategic planning process underway within the Division of Academic Affairs.

RELATED ITEMS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Provide Quality Strategic Planning Resources And Processes

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will provide quality strategic planning resources and facilitate effective planning processes within the Division of Academic Affairs.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Facilitate Development Of A Comprehensive And Quality Academic Affairs Strategic Plan

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will facilitate strategic planning discussions within Academic Affairs, providing the necessary resources and structure to the process. Planning meetings and retreats will be scheduled and data resources provided as needed.

Results Description:

Limited strategic planning discussions and progress occurred during the 2015-2016 academic year.